arXiv:1402.7254v1 [quant-ph] 28 Feb 2014

Generalizations of the distributed Deutsch-Jozsa promise problem

Jozef Gruska[1], Daowen Qiu[2], Shenggen Zheng[1,*]

[1] *Faculty of Informatics, Masaryk University, Brno 60200, Czech Republic*
[2] *Department of Computer Science, Sun Yat-sen University, Guangzhou 510006, China*

Abstract

In the distributed *Deutsch-Jozsa promise problem*, two parties are to determine whether their respective strings $x, y \in \{0,1\}^n$ are at the Hamming distance $H(x,y) = 0$ or $H(x,y) = \frac{n}{2}$. Buhrman et al. (STOC' 98) proved that the exact *quantum communication complexity* of this problem is $\mathbf{O}(\log n)$ while the *deterministic communication complexity* is $\mathbf{\Omega}(n)$. This was the first impressively (exponential) gap between quantum and classical communication complexity. In this paper, we generalize the above distributed Deutsch-Jozsa promise problem to determine for a fixed $k \geq \frac{n}{2}$ whether $H(x,y) = 0$ or $H(x,y) = k$. We will also discuss the promise versions of the well-known *disjointness* problem. Applications to *finite automata* of the results obtained are also shown in this paper.

Keywords: Quantum communication complexity, Deutsch-Jozsa promise problem, Query complexity, Finite automata

1. Introduction

Since the topic of communication complexity was introduced by Yao [29] in 1979, it has been extensively studied [7, 11, 18, 22]. In the setting of two parties, Alice is given an input $x \in \{0,1\}^n$, Bob is given an input $y \in \{0,1\}^n$ and their task is to communicate in order to be able to compute the value of some Boolean function $f : \{0,1\}^n \times \{0,1\}^n \to \{0,1\}$, while exchanging as small number of bits between Alice and Bob as possible. In this case, local computation is considered to be free, but communication is considered to be expensive and has to be minimized during communications. Alice and Bob can use all computation power of their machines. There are three kinds of communication complexities according to the models (or protocols) used by Alice and Bob: deterministic, probabilistic or quantum.

Two of the most studied communication problems are equality and disjointness [22], defined as follows:

- **Equality**: $\mathrm{EQ}(x,y) = 1$ if $x = y$ and 0 otherwise.
- **Disjointness**: $\mathrm{DISJ}(x,y) = 1$ if there is no index i such that $x_i = y_i = 1$ and 0 if such an index exists. Equivalently, this function can be defined also as $\mathrm{DISJ}(x,y) = 1$ if $\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i \wedge y_i = 0$ and 0 if $\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i \wedge y_i > 0$. (We can also think of x and y as being subsets of $\{1, \cdots, n\}$ represented by characteristic vectors and to have $\mathrm{DISJ}(x,y) = 1$ iff these two subsets are disjoint.)

*Corresponding author.
E-mail addresses: zhengshenggen@gmail.com (S. Zheng), gruska@fi.muni.cz (J. Gruska), issqdw@mail.sysu.edu.cn (D. Qiu).

The deterministic communication complexities for EQ and DISJ problems are both n [22].

Buhrman et al. [9, 11] proved that the exact quantum communication complexity of the distributed Deutsch-Jozsa promise problem,

$$\mathrm{EQ}'(x,y) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } H(x,y) = 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } H(x,y) = \frac{n}{2} \end{cases}, \tag{1}$$

is $\mathbf{O}(\log n)$, where $H(x,y)$ is the Hamming distance between x and y. This was the first impressively large (exponential) gap between quantum and classical communication complexity[1].

It has been so far a folklore belief that the promise $H(x,y) = \frac{n}{2}$ is essential for the above result. However, we prove that the result holds also for following generalizations of this promise problem

$$\mathrm{EQ}_k(x,y) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } H(x,y) = 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } H(x,y) = k \end{cases}, \tag{2}$$

where the fixed $k \geq \frac{n}{2}$, that is the exact quantum communication complexity of EQ_k is $\mathbf{O}(\log n)$ while the classical deterministic communication complexity is $\mathbf{\Omega}(n)$ if k is even and $k = \lambda n$ (λ is always a constant that does not relate to n in this paper). Our proof has been inspired by the proof methods in [4].

Let us consider also a corresponding problem in quantum query complexity. Namely, some analogue of the Deutsch-Jozsa promise problem:

$$\mathrm{DJ}_k(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } |x| = 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } |x| > k \end{cases}, \tag{3}$$

where the fixed $k \geq \frac{n}{2}$ and $|x|$ is the Hamming weight of x. We prove that the exact quantum query complexity of DJ_k is 1 while the deterministic query complexity is $n - k + 1$.

If errors are tolerated, both quantum and probabilistic communication complexity of the equality problem are $\mathbf{O}(\log n)$. Concerning communication complexity of the disjointness problem, even in the case an error is tolerated, the probabilistic communication complexity of the disjointness problem is $\mathbf{\Omega}(n)$ [6, 21, 27]. In the quantum cases, Buhrman et al. [9] proved that the quantum communication complexity of DISJ is $\mathbf{O}(\sqrt{n}\log n)$. This bound was improved to $\mathbf{O}(\sqrt{n})$ by Aaronson and Ambainis [1]. Finally, Razborov showed that any bounded-error quantum protocol for DISJ needs to communicate about $\sqrt{n}$ qubits [28]. It is unlike the problem EQ for which there is an exponential gap between quantum (probabilistic) communication complexity and deterministic communication complexity [9, 11, 22]. All the known gaps of DISJ are not larger than quadratic. It is therefore interesting to find out whether there are some promise versions of the disjointness problem for which bigger communication complexity gaps can be obtained. We give a positive answer to such a question. In order to prove that, we consider the following promise problems, for $0 < \lambda \leq \frac{1}{4}$,

$$\mathrm{DISJ}_\lambda(x,y) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \sum_{i=1}^n x_i \wedge y_i = 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } \lambda n \leq \sum_{i=1}^n x_i \wedge y_i \leq (1-\lambda)n \end{cases}. \tag{4}$$

We prove that quantum communication complexity of DISJ_λ is not more than $\frac{\log 3}{3\lambda}(3 + 2\log n)$ while the deterministic communication complexity of DISJ_λ is $\mathbf{\Omega}(n)$. For example, if $\lambda = \frac{1}{4}$, then the quantum

[1] In fact, $\frac{n}{2}$ must be even in order to obtain an exponential quantum speed-up. We will give our argument in Remark 2 in Section 3.

communication complexity of $\mathrm{DISJ}_{\frac{1}{4}}$ is not more than $3 + 2\log n$ while the deterministic communication complexity of DISJ_λ is more than 0.007n. We prove also that probabilistic communication complexity of DISJ_λ is not more than $\frac{\log 3}{\lambda} \log n$. Therefore, there is an exponential gap between quantum (probabilistic) communication complexity and deterministic communication complexity of the above promise problem.

Number of states is a natural complexity measure for all models of finite automata and state complexity of finite automata is one of the research fields with many applications [31]. There is a variety of methods how to prove lower bounds on state complexity and methods as well as the results of communication complexity are among the main ones [19, 20, 22]. In this paper we also show how to make use of our new communication complexity results to get new state complexity outcomes.

The paper is structured as follows. In Section 2 basic needed concepts and notations are introduced and models involved are described in details. Communication complexities and query complexities of EQ_k and DJ_k promise problems are investigated in Section 3. Communication complexity of DISJ_λ is discussed in Section 4. Applications to finite automata are explored in Section 5. Some open questions are discussed in Section 6.

2. Preliminaries

In this section, we recall some basic definitions about communication complexity, query complexity and quantum finite automata. Concerning basic concepts and notations of quantum information processing, we refer the reader to [15, 24].

2.1. Communication complexity

We recall only very basic concepts and notations of *communication complexity*, and we refer the reader to [11, 22, 29] for more details. We will deal with the situation that there are two communicating parties and with very simple tasks of computing two argument functions for the case one argument is known to one party and the other argument is known to the other party. We will completely ignore computational resources needed by parties and we focus solely on the amount of communication that is need to be exchanged between both parties in order to compute the value of a Boolean function.

More technically, let X, Y be finite sets $\{0,1\}^n$. We consider a two-argument function $f : X \times Y \to \{0,1\}$ and two communicating parties. Alice is given an input $x \in X$ and Bob is given an input $y \in Y$. They wish to compute $f(x, y)$. If f is defined only on a proper subset of $X \times Y$, f is said to be a partial function or a promise problem.




Figure 1: Communication protocol

The computation of $f(x, y)$ will be done using a communication protocol, see Figure 1. During the execution of the protocol, the two parties alternate roles in sending messages. Each of these messages is a bit-string. The protocol, whose steps are based on the communication so far, specifies also for each step whether the communication terminates (in which case it also specifies what is the output). If the communication is not to terminate, the protocol specifies what kind of message the sender (Alice or Bob) should send next, as a function of its input and communication so far.

A deterministic communication protocol $\mathcal{P}$ computes the (partial) function f, if for every (promise) input pair $(x, y) \in X \times Y$ the protocol terminates with the value $f(x, y)$ as its output. In a probabilistic protocol, Alice and Bob may flip coins during the protocol execution and the protocol can have an erroneous output with a small probability. In a quantum protocol, Alice and Bob may use quantum resources and send qubits.

Let $\mathcal{P}(x, y)$ denote the output of the protocol $\mathcal{P}$, we will consider two different kinds of protocols for computing f:

- An exact protocol always outputs the right answer, $Pr(\mathcal{P}(x, y) = f(x, y)) = 1$.
- A two-sided error (a bounded error) protocol $\mathcal{P}$ is such that $Pr(\mathcal{P}(x, y) = f(x, y)) \geq \frac{2}{3}$.

The communication complexity of a protocol $\mathcal{P}$ is the worst case number of (qu)bits exchanged. The communication complexity of f is, with which respect to the communication mode used, the complexity of an optimal protocol for f.

We will use $D(f), R(f)$ to denote the deterministic communication complexity and the two-sided error probabilistic communication complexity, respectively. Similarly we define $Q_E(f), Q(f)$ for the exact and two-sided error quantum communication complexities.

Finally, let us summarize already known communication complexity results about communication problem EQ, DISJ and EQ$'$ as following:

1. $D(\mathrm{EQ}) = n$, $D(\mathrm{DISJ}) = n$ [22], $D(\mathrm{EQ}') \in \mathbf{\Omega}(n)$ [9, 11].
2. $Q_E(\mathrm{EQ}') \in \mathbf{O}(\log n)$ [9, 11].
3. $R(\mathrm{EQ}) \in \mathbf{O}(\log n)$ [22], $R(\mathrm{DISJ}) \in \mathbf{\Omega}(n)$ [6, 21, 27].
4. $Q(\mathrm{DISJ}) \in \mathbf{\Theta}(\sqrt{\mathbf{n}})$ [1, 28].

2.2. Exact query complexity

Exact quantum query complexity for partial functions were dealt with in [8, 13]. Recently, also exact quantum query complexity for total functions was dealt with in [4, 5, 23].

In the next we recall definitions of two exact query complexity models. Concerning more basic concepts and notations concerning query complexity, we refer the reader to [12].

An exact classical (deterministic) query algorithm to compute a Boolean function $f : \{0, 1\}^n \to \{0, 1\}$ can be described by a decision tree. A decision tree T is a rooted binary tree in which each internal vertex has exactly two children, each internal vertex is labeled with a variable x_i and each leaf is labeled with a value 0 or 1. T computes the function f as follows: Let us start at the root. If this is a leaf then stop. Otherwise, query the value of the variable x_i that labels the root. If $x_i = 0$, then recursively evaluate the left subtree, if $x_i = 1$ then the right subtree. The output of the tree is the value of the leaf that is reached eventually. The depth of T is the maximal length of a path from the root to a leaf (i.e. the worst-case number of queries used on any input). The minimal depth over all decision trees computing f is the exact classical query complexity (deterministic query complexity, decision tree complexity) $DT(f)$.

Let $f : \{0,1\}^n \to \{0,1\}$ be a Boolean function and its input bit string be $x = x_1x_2\cdots x_n$. An exact quantum query algorithm for f is considered to work in a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ and let us consider some fixed basis states $\mathcal{B}$ of $\mathcal{H}$. It starts in a fixed starting state, then performs on it a sequence of transformations U_1, Q, U_2, Q, ..., U_t, Q, U_{t+1}. Unitary transformations U_i do not depend on the input bits, while Q, called the *query transformation*, does, in the following way. Each of the states of $\mathcal{B}$ is to correspond to either one or none of the input bits. If the basis state $|\psi\rangle$ corresponds to the i-th input bit, then $Q|\psi\rangle = (-1)^{x_i}|\psi\rangle$. If it does not correspond to any input bit, then Q leaves it unchanged: $Q|\psi\rangle = |\psi\rangle$. Finally, the algorithm performs a measurement in the standard basis. Depending on the result of the measurement, the algorithm outputs either 0 or 1 which is equal to $f(x)$. The minimum number of queries made by any quantum algorithm computing f is denoted by $QT_E(f)$.

2.3. Lower bound methods of deterministic communication complexity

There are quite a few of lower bound methods known to determine deterministic communication complexity. We just recall the "rectangles" method in this subsection. Concerning more on lower bound methods, we refer the reader to [11, 18, 22].

A *rectangle* of a Carter product $X \times Y$ is a set $R = A \times B$ with $A \subseteq X$ and $B \subseteq Y$. A rectangle $R = A \times B$ is called 1(0)-rectangle of a function $f : X \times Y \to \{0,1\}$ if for every $x \in A$ and $y \in B$ the value of $f(x,y)$ is 1 (0). Moreover $C^i(f)$ is defined as the minimum number of i-rectangles that partition the space of i-inputs (such inputs x and y that $f(x,y) = i$).

Lemma 1. [22] *For every function $f : X \times Y \to \{0,1\}$, $D(f) \geq \max\{\log C^1(f), \log C^0(f)\}$.*

Remark 1. For a partial function $f : X \times Y \supset \mathcal{D} \to \{0,1\}$, a rectangle $R = A \times B$ is called 1(0)-rectangle if the value of $f(x,y)$ is 1(0) for every $(x,y) \in \mathcal{D} \cap (A \times B)$ – we do not care about values for $(x,y) \notin \mathcal{D}$. The above lemma still holds for promise problems (that is for partial functions).

2.4. One-way finite automata with quantum and classical state (1QCFA)

In this subsection we recall the definition of 1QCFA. Concerning more on classical and quantum automata [15–17, 25].

Two-way finite automata with quantum and classical states were introduced by Ambainis and Watrous [2] and explored also by Yakaryilmaz, Zheng and others [30, 33–35]. Informally, a 2QCFA can be seen as a *two-way deterministic finite automata* (2DFA) with an access to a quantum memory for states of a fixed Hilbert space upon which at each step either a unitary operation is performed or a projective measurement and the outcomes of which then probabilistically determine the next move of the underlying 2DFA. 1QCFA are one-way versions of 2QCFA [32]. In this paper, we only use 1QCFA in which a unitary transformation is applied in every step after scanning a symbol and a measurement is performed only after the scanning of the right end-marker. Such model is a measure-once 1QCFA (MO-1QCFA) and corresponds to a variant of MO-1QFA, which can also be seen as a special case of *one-way quantum finite automata together with classical states* in [26].

Definition 1. An MO-1QCFA $\mathcal{A}$ is specified by a 10-tuple

$$\mathcal{A} = (Q, S, \Sigma, \Theta, \Delta, \delta, |q_0\rangle, s_0, S_{acc}, S_{rej}) \tag{5}$$

1. Q is a finite set of orthonormal quantum (basis) states.

2. S is a finite set of classical states.
3. Σ is a finite alphabet of input symbols and let $\Sigma' = \Sigma \cup \{\text{¢}, \$\}$, where ¢ will be used as the left end-marker and \$ as the right end-marker.
4. $|q_0\rangle \in Q$ is the initial quantum state.
5. s_0 is the initial classical state.
6. $S_{acc} \subset S$ and $S_{rej} \subset S$, where $S_{acc} \cap S_{rej} = \emptyset$ are sets of the classical accepting and rejecting states, respectively.
7. Θ is a quantum transition function

$$\Theta : S \setminus (S_{acc} \cup S_{rej}) \times \Sigma' \to U(\mathcal{H}(Q)), \tag{6}$$

where $U(\mathcal{H}(Q))$ is set of unitary operations on the Hilbert space generated by quantum states from Q.

8. δ is a classical transition function

$$\delta : S \setminus (S_{acc} \cup S_{rej}) \times \Sigma' \to S. \tag{7}$$

If $\delta(s, \sigma) = (s')$, then the new classical state of the automaton is s'.

9. Δ is the mapping:

$$\Delta : S \to O(\mathcal{H}(Q)), \tag{8}$$

where $O(\mathcal{H}(Q))$ is set of projective measurements on the Hilbert space generated by quantum states from Q.

The computation of an MO-1QCFA $\mathcal{A} = (Q, S, \Sigma, \Theta, \Delta, \delta, |q_0\rangle, s_0, S_{acc}, S_{rej})$ on an input $w = \sigma_1 \cdots \sigma_n \in \Sigma^*$ starts with the string ¢x\$ on the input tape. At the start, the tape head of the automation is positioned on the left end-marker and the automaton begins the computation in the initial classical state and in the initial quantum state. After that, in each step, if its classical state is s, its tape head reads a symbol σ and its quantum state is $|\psi\rangle$, then the automaton changes its quantum state to $\Theta(s, \sigma)|\psi\rangle$ and its classical state to $\delta(s, \sigma)$. At the end of the computation, a projective measurement, which has two possible classical outcomes a and r, is applied on the current quantum state. If the classical outcome is a (r), then the input is accepted (rejected).

For any string $w \in (\Sigma')^*$ and any $\sigma \in \Sigma$, let $\widehat{\delta}(s, \sigma w) = \widehat{\delta}(\delta(s, \sigma), w)$; if $|w| = 0$, $\widehat{\delta}(s, w) = s$. Let $\sigma_0 =$ ¢ and $\sigma_{n+1} = \$$. Assume that $\widehat{\delta}(s_0, \sigma_0 \cdots \sigma_i) = s_{i+1}$. Suppose the measurement is $M = \{P_a, P_r\}$, then the probability that $\mathcal{A}$ accepts the input

$$Pr[\mathcal{A} \text{ accepts } w] = \|P_a U(s_{n+1}, \sigma_{n+1}) \cdots U(s_1, \sigma_1) U(s_0, \sigma_0) |q_0\rangle\|^2. \tag{9}$$

The probability that $\mathcal{A}$ rejects the input is $Pr[\mathcal{A} \text{ rejects } w] = 1 - Pr[\mathcal{A} \text{ accepts } w]$.

Language acceptance is a special case of so called promise problem solving. A *promise problem* is a pair $A = (A_{yes}, A_{no})$, where A_{yes}, $A_{no} \subset \Sigma^*$ are disjoint sets. Languages may be viewed as promise problems that obey the additional constraint $A_{yes} \cup A_{no} = \Sigma^*$.

A promise problem $A = (A_{yes}, A_{no})$ is solved exactly by a finite automata $\mathcal{A}$ if

1. $\forall w \in A_{yes}$, $Pr[\mathcal{A} \text{ accepts } w] = 1$, and
2. $\forall w \in A_{no}$, $Pr[\mathcal{A} \text{ rejects } w] = 1$.

Let $0 < \varepsilon \leq \frac{1}{2}$. A finite automata $\mathcal{A}$ solves a promise problem $A = (A_{yes}, A_{no})$ with a one-sided error ε if

1. $\forall w \in A_{yes}$, $Pr[\mathcal{A} \text{ accepts } w] = 1$, and
2. $\forall w \in A_{no}$, $Pr[\mathcal{A} \text{ rejects } w] \geq 1 - \varepsilon$.

3. Generalizations of the distributed Deutsch-Jozsa promise problem

Theorem 1. *The exact quantum communication complexity* $Q_E(EQ_k) \in \mathbf{O}(\log n)$.

Proof. Assume that Alice is given an input $x = x_1, \cdots, x_n$ and Bob an input $y = y_1, \cdots, y_n$. The quantum communication protocol $\mathcal{P}$ solves $\mathrm{EQ}_k(x, y)$ using $n + 1$ quantum basis states $|0\rangle, |1\rangle, \ldots, |n\rangle$ as follows:

1. Alice begins with the initial quantum state $|0\rangle$ and performs on her quantum state a unitary map U_k such that $U_k|0\rangle = \sqrt{\frac{2k-n}{2k}}|0\rangle + \sqrt{\frac{n}{2k}}|1\rangle$, where
$$U_k = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\frac{2k-n}{2k}} & -\sqrt{\frac{n}{2k}} & \mathbf{0} \\ \sqrt{\frac{n}{2k}} & \sqrt{\frac{2k-n}{2k}} & \mathbf{0} \\ \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{0} & \mathbf{I}_{n-1,n-1} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{10}$$
2. Alice performs the unitary map U_h on her quantum state such that $U_h|1\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} |i\rangle$ and $U_h|0\rangle = |0\rangle$, i.e. the first column of U_h is $(1, 0, \ldots, 0)^T$ and the second column of U_h is $(0, \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}, \ldots, \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}})^T$.
3. Alice applies the unitary map U_x to the state such that $U_x|i\rangle = (-1)^{x_i}|i\rangle$ for $i > 0$ and $U_x|0\rangle = |0\rangle$.
4. Alice sends her state $|\psi_4\rangle = U_x U_h U_k|0\rangle = \sqrt{\frac{2k-n}{2k}}|0\rangle + \sqrt{\frac{n}{2k}}\sqrt{\frac{1}{n}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (-1)^{x_i}|i\rangle$ to Bob.
5. Bob applies the unitary map U_y to the state that he has received such that $U_y|i\rangle = (-1)^{y_i}|i\rangle$ for $i > 0$ and $U_y|0\rangle = |0\rangle$.
6. Bob applies the unitary map U_h^{-1} to his quantum state.
7. Bob performs the unitary map U_k^{-1} to his quantum state.
8. Bob measures the resulting state and outputs 1 if the measurement outcome is $|0\rangle$ and outputs 0 otherwise.

The state after the step 5 is

$$|\psi_5\rangle = U_y U_x U_h U_k|0\rangle = \sqrt{\frac{2k-n}{2k}}|0\rangle + \sqrt{\frac{n}{2k}}\sqrt{\frac{1}{n}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (-1)^{x_i + y_i}|i\rangle. \tag{11}$$

If $x = y$, the state after the step 7 is

$$|\psi_7\rangle = U_k^{-1} U_h^{-1} U_y U_x U_h U_k|0\rangle = U_k^{-1} U_h^{-1} U_h U_k|0\rangle = |0\rangle. \tag{12}$$

If $x \neq y$, then $H(x,y) = k$ and the state after the step 7 is

$$|\psi_7\rangle = U_k^{-1}U_h^{-1}U_yU_xU_hU_k|0\rangle = U_k^{-1}U_h^{-1}\left(\sqrt{\frac{2k-n}{2k}}|0\rangle + \sqrt{\frac{n}{2k}}\sqrt{\frac{1}{n}}\sum_{i=1}^{n}(-1)^{x_i+y_i}|i\rangle\right) \tag{13}$$

$$= U_k^{-1}\left(\sqrt{\frac{2k-n}{2k}}|0\rangle + \sqrt{\frac{n}{2k}}\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}(-1)^{x_i+y_i}|1\rangle + \sum_{i=2}^{n}\alpha_i|i\rangle\right) \tag{14}$$

$$= U_k^{-1}\left(\sqrt{\frac{2k-n}{2k}}|0\rangle + \sqrt{\frac{n}{2k}}\frac{n-2k}{n}|1\rangle + \sum_{i=2}^{n}\alpha_i|i\rangle\right) \tag{15}$$

$$= \left(\sqrt{\frac{2k-n}{2k}}\sqrt{\frac{2k-n}{2k}} + \sqrt{\frac{n}{2k}}\sqrt{\frac{n}{2k}}\frac{n-2k}{n}\right)|0\rangle + \sum_{i=1}^{n}\beta_i|i\rangle \tag{16}$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^{n}\beta_i|i\rangle. \tag{17}$$

Because the amplitude of $|0\rangle$ is 0, we can get the exact result after the measurement in the step 8.

It is clear that this protocol communicates only $\lceil \log(n+1) \rceil$ qubits.

□

Obviously, the deterministic communication complexity $D(\mathrm{EQ}_k) \leq n-k+1$. For the case $k = \frac{n}{2}$ (k is even), $\mathrm{EQ}_k = \mathrm{EQ}'$ and $D(\mathrm{EQ}_k) \in \mathbf{\Omega}(n)$ [9, 11]. For the cases that k is even and $k = \lambda n$, using a similar proof method as [9, 11], we can prove the following theorem:

Theorem 2. *If k is even and $k = \lambda n$, where $\frac{1}{2} < \lambda < 1$, then $D(EQ_k) \in \mathbf{\Omega}(n)$.*

Proof. In order to prove the theorem, we introduce a Lemma (Theorem 1 in [14]) first.

Let $x, y \in \{0,1\}^n$, denote $|x \wedge y| = \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i \wedge y_i$. Let $m(n,\overline{l})$ denote the maximum of $|F|$, where $F \subset \{0,1\}^n$ subject to the constraint: $|x \wedge y| \neq l$ holds for all distinct $x, y \in F$.

Lemma 2. [14] *Suppose $0 < \eta < \frac{1}{4}$ is given, then there exists a positive constant $\varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon_0(\eta)$ so that $m(n,\overline{l}) \leq (2-\varepsilon_0)^n$ holds for all l such that $\eta n < l < (\frac{1}{2} - \eta)n$.*

Let $\mathcal{P}$ be a deterministic protocol for EQ_k. We consider the set $E = \{(x,x) \,|\, |x| = \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor\}$. For every $(x,x) \in E$, we have $\mathcal{P}(x,x) = 1$. Suppose there is a 1-monochromatic rectangle $R = A \times B \subseteq \{0,1\}^n \times \{0,1\}^n$ such that $\mathcal{P}(x,y) = 1$ for every promise pair $(x,y) \in R$. Let $S = R \cap E$, we now prove that for any distinct $(x,x),(y,y) \in S$, $|x \wedge y| \neq \lfloor \frac{n-k}{2} \rfloor$.

If $|x \wedge y| = \lfloor \frac{n-k}{2} \rfloor$, then $H(x,y) = 2(\lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor - \lfloor \frac{n-k}{2} \rfloor) = k$ and $\mathcal{P}(x,y) = 0$. Since $(x,x) \in R$ and $(y,y) \in R$, we have $(x,y) \in R$ and $\mathcal{P}(x,y) = 0$, which is a contradiction.

Because of the assumption $0 < \lfloor \frac{n-k}{2} \rfloor < \frac{1}{4}$, there exists a constant ε_0 such that $|S| \leq (2-\varepsilon_0)^n$.

Let us now continue the proof of the Theorem. Because of Lemma 2, the minimum number of 1-monochromatic rectangles that partition the space of inputs is

$$C^1(\mathrm{EQ}_k) \geq \frac{|E|}{|S|} \geq \frac{\binom{n}{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}}{(2-\varepsilon_0)^n} > \frac{2^n/n}{(2-\varepsilon_0)^n}. \tag{18}$$

According to Lemma 1, the deterministic communication complexity is then

$$D(\mathrm{EQ}_k) \geq \log C^1(\mathrm{EQ}_k) > \log \frac{2^n/n}{(2-\varepsilon_0)^n} = n - \log n - n\log(2-\varepsilon_0). \tag{19}$$

Since $1-u \leq e^{-u} \leq 2^{-u}$ for any real number $u > 0$, we have $\log(2-\varepsilon_0) < 1 - \varepsilon_0/2$. Therefore

$$D(\mathrm{EQ}_k) \geq n - \log n - n(1 - \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2}) = \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2}n - \log n. \tag{20}$$

Thus, $D(\mathrm{EQ}_k) \in \mathbf{\Omega}(n)$. □

Remark 2. If k is odd, we can prove that $D(\mathrm{EQ}_k) \in \mathbf{O}(1)$ as follows:

1. Alice calculates $|x|$ and then sends one bit information of $|x|$'s parity to Bob (says, Alice sends "1" if $|x|$ is even and "0" otherwise).
2. After receiving Alice's information, Bob then calculates $|y|$. If the parities of $|y|$ and $|x|$ is the same, then $\mathrm{EQ}_k(x,y) = 1$; otherwise, $\mathrm{EQ}_k(x,y) = 0$.

The above protocol computes EQ_k since if $H(x,y) = 0$, $|x| + |y|$ must be oven; if $H(x,y) = k$, then the parity of $|x| + |y|$ must be the same as the parity of k.

We can now explore also the exact quantum query complexity of DJ_k.

Theorem 3. *The exact quantum query complexity* $QT_E(DJ_k) = 1$.

Proof. The query algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ using $n+1$ quantum basis states $|0\rangle, |1\rangle, \ldots, |n\rangle$ will work as follows:

1. $\mathcal{A}$ begins in the state $|0\rangle$ and performs on it a unitary transformation $U_1 = U_h U_k$.
2. $\mathcal{A}$ performs a query Q.
3. $\mathcal{A}$ performs a unitary transformation $U_2 = U_k^{-1} U_h^{-1}$.
4. $\mathcal{A}$ measures the resulting state and outputs 1 if the measurement outcome is $|0\rangle$ and outputs 0 otherwise.

The unitary transformations U_k and U_h are the same ones as defined in Theorem 1. The proof is an analogue of Theorem 1. □

Obviously, the exact classical query complexity of DJ_k is $n - k + 1$. If $k = \lambda n$, then $DT(\mathrm{DJ}_k) \in \mathbf{\Omega}(n)$.

4. Communication complexity of the promise versions of the disjointness problem

One may think that if we make a similar promise as EQ_k, we can get a similar result. Let us denote that

$$\mathrm{DISJ}'_k(x,y) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } \sum_{i=1}^n x_i \wedge y_i = 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } \sum_{i=1}^n x_i \wedge y_i = k \end{cases}, \tag{21}$$

where the fixed $k \geq \frac{n}{2}$. Indeed, using an analogous proof method as Section 3, we can prove that $Q_E(\mathrm{DISJ}'_k) \in \mathbf{O}(\log n)$. But comparing to deterministic communication complexity, it is no improvement at all. We can prove that $D(\mathrm{DISJ}'_k) \in \mathbf{O}(1)$ as follows:

1. Alice calculates $|x|$. If $|x| < k$, then Alice sends the result $\mathrm{DISJ}'_k(x,y) = 1$ to Bob; otherwise, she sends 0 to Bob. (In the case that $k = \frac{n}{2}$: if $|x| = \frac{n}{2}$, Alice sends 0 and x_1 to Bob.)
2. After receiving Alice's information, if Bob does not get the result $\mathrm{DISJ}'_k(x,y) = 1$ from Alice, he then calculates $|y|$. If $|y| < k$, then Bob outputs the result $\mathrm{DISJ}'_k(x,y) = 1$; otherwise, $\mathrm{DISJ}'_k(x,y) = 0$. (In the case that $k = \frac{n}{2}$: if $|x| = |y| = \frac{n}{2}$, Bob compares y_1 with x_1 and then outputs the result $\mathrm{DISJ}'_k(x,y) = 0$ if $y_1 = x_1$ and $\mathrm{DISJ}'_k(x,y) = 1$ if $y_1 \neq x_1$).

Obviously, the above protocol computes $\mathrm{DISJ}'_k(x,y)$ and communicates only $\mathbf{O}(1)$ bits.

Therefore, in order to get some advantages over deterministic communication, we consider DISJ_λ instead. In this section we give quantum and probabilistic upper bounds and a deterministic lower bound for DISJ_λ.

4.1. Quantum protocol

We give at first a quantum communication protocol for $\mathrm{DISJ}_{\frac{1}{4}}(x, y)$.

Theorem 4. *The quantum communication complexity* $Q(DISJ_{\frac{1}{4}}) \leq 3 + 2\log n$.

Proof. Assume that Alice is given an input $x = x_1, \cdots, x_n$ and Bob an input $y = y_1, \cdots, y_n$. The quantum communication protocol $\mathcal{P}$ for $\mathrm{DISJ}_{\frac{1}{4}}$ will work as follows:

1. Alice starts with a quantum state $|\psi_0\rangle = |1, 0\rangle = (1, \overbrace{0, \cdots, 0}^{2n-1})^T$ and applies the following unitary transformation U_s:
$$U_s|\psi_0\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}|i, 0\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}(\overbrace{1, \cdots, 1}^{n}, \overbrace{0, \cdots, 0}^{n})^T. \tag{22}$$
Alice then applies a unitary transformation U_x according to her input $x = x_1, \cdots, x_n$:
$$U_x = U_{x_n} \cdots U_{x_1} \tag{23}$$
where
$$U_{x_i} = \begin{cases} I & \text{if } x_i = 0 \\ |i,1\rangle\langle i,0| + |i,0\rangle\langle i,1| + \sum_{j\neq i} |j,0\rangle\langle j,0| + \sum_{j\neq i} |j,1\rangle\langle j,1| & \text{if } x_i = 1 \end{cases}. \tag{24}$$
U_x can be seen as a unitary transformation that exchanges the amplitudes of $|i, 0\rangle$ and $|i, 1\rangle$ if $x_i = 1$. The quantum state after performing U_x will be
$$|\psi_1\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} ((1 - x_i)|i, 0\rangle + x_i|i, 1\rangle) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}(\overline{x}_1, \cdots, \overline{x}_n, x_1, \cdots, x_n)^T, \tag{25}$$
where $\overline{x}_i = 1 - x_i$. Alice then sends her quantum state $|\psi_1\rangle$ to Bob.
2. Bob then applies to the state received a unitary mapping V_y, defined for his input y as follows
$$V_y|i, 0\rangle = |i, 0\rangle \tag{26}$$
and
$$V_y|i, 1\rangle = (-1)^{y_i}|i, 1\rangle. \tag{27}$$
The quantum state after applying V_y is
$$|\psi_2\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}(\overline{x}_1, \cdots, \overline{x}_n, (-1)^{y_1}x_1, \cdots, (-1)^{y_n}x_n)^T. \tag{28}$$
If $x_i = y_i = 1$, then $(-1)^{y_i}x_i = -1 = (-1)^{x_i \wedge y_i}$; if $x_i = 1$ and $y_i = 0$, then $(-1)^{y_i}x_i = 1 = (-1)^{x_i \wedge y_i}$; otherwise $(-1)^{y_i}x_i = 0$.
3. Alice applies the unitary transformation U_x to the quantum state $|\psi_2\rangle$ received from Bob and gets a new quantum state:
$$|\psi_3\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}(z_1, \cdots, z_n, \overbrace{0, \cdots, 0}^{n})^T. \tag{29}$$
If $x_i = 0$, then $z_i = \overline{x}_i = 1 = (-1)^{x_i \wedge y_i}$. If $x_i = 1$, then $z_i = (-1)^{y_i}x_i = (-1)^{x_i \wedge y_i}$. Therefore, $z_i = (-1)^{x_i \wedge y_i}$ for $1 \leq i \leq n$.

Alice then applies the unitary transformation U_f (U_f which will be specified later) to get the follow state:

$$U_f|\psi_3\rangle = (\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}(-1)^{x_i\wedge y_i}, \overbrace{*,\cdots,*}^{2n-1})^T. \tag{30}$$

and then measures the final quantum state with $\{|i,0\rangle\langle i,0|, |i,1\rangle\langle i,1|\}_{i=1}^n$. If the measurement outcome is $|1,0\rangle$, then Alice sends 1 to Bob; otherwise, Alice sends 0 to Bob.

It is clear that this protocol communicates $1+2(\log 2n) = 3+2\log n$ qubits. Unitary transformations U_s and U_f do exist. The first column of U_s is $\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}(\overbrace{1,\cdots,1}^{n},\overbrace{0,\cdots,0}^{n})^T$ and the first row of U_f is $\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}(\overbrace{1,\cdots,1}^{n},\overbrace{0,\cdots,0}^{n})$. It is easy to verify that V_y is a unitary transformation.

If $\sum_{i=1}^n x_i\wedge y_i = 0$, then $\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n(-1)^{x_i\wedge y_i} = 1$. After the measurement, Alice gets the quantum outcome $|1,0\rangle$ and sends 1 to Bob with certainty. Thus,

$$Pr(\mathcal{P}(x,y) = \mathrm{DISJ}_{\frac{1}{4}}(x,y)) = 1. \tag{31}$$

If $n/4 \le \sum_{i=1}^n x_i\wedge y_i \le 3n/4$, then $|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n(-1)^{x_i\wedge y_i}| \le 1/2$. Alice gets the quantum outcome $|1,0\rangle$ with probability not more than $|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n(-1)^{x_i\wedge y_i}|^2 = 1/4$. Thus,

$$Pr(\mathcal{P}(x,y) = \mathrm{DISJ}_{\frac{1}{4}}(x,y)) = 1 - \left|\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}(-1)^{x_i\wedge y_i}\right|^2 \ge \frac{3}{4}. \tag{32}$$

Therefore $\mathcal{P}$ is a two-sided error quantum protocol for $\mathrm{DISJ}_{\frac{1}{4}}$ and $Q(\mathrm{DISJ}_{\frac{1}{4}}) \le 3+2\log n$. □

Theorem 5. *The quantum communication complexity* $Q(DISJ_\lambda) \le \frac{\log 3}{3\lambda}(3+2\log n)$.

Proof. For general cases, the new quantum protocol $\mathcal{P}'$ works as follows: Repeat the protocol $\mathcal{P}$ from the proof of the previous theorem k times (k will be specified later). If all the measurement outcomes in Step 3 are $|1,0\rangle$, then $\mathcal{P}'(x,y) = 1$; otherwise, $\mathcal{P}'(x,y) = 0$.

If $\sum_{i=1}^n x_i\wedge y_i = 0$, then

$$Pr(\mathcal{P}(x,y) = 1) = 1 \tag{33}$$

and

$$Pr(\mathcal{P}(x,y) = 0) = 0. \tag{34}$$

Therefore,

$$Pr(\mathcal{P}'(x,y) = \mathrm{DISJ}_\lambda(x,y) = 1) = 1. \tag{35}$$

If $\lambda n \le \sum_{i=1}^n x_i\wedge y_i \le (1-\lambda)n$, then

$$p_0 = Pr(\mathcal{P}(x,y) = \mathrm{DISJ}_\lambda(x,y) = 0) = 1 - |\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}(-1)^{x_i\wedge y_i}|^2 \ge 1 - |1-2\lambda|^2 \tag{36}$$

$$= 4\lambda - \lambda^2 = 4\lambda(1-\lambda) \ge 4\lambda(1-\frac{1}{4}) = 3\lambda. \tag{37}$$

If $k = \frac{\log 1/3}{\log(1-3\lambda)}$, and the protocol is repeated $\mathcal{P}$ k times, then

$$Pr(\mathcal{P}'(x,y) = \mathrm{DISJ}_\lambda(x,y) = 0) = 1 - (1-p_0)^k \geq 1 - (1-3\lambda)^k \geq 1 - (1-3\lambda)^{\frac{\log 1/3}{\log(1-3\lambda)}} \tag{38}$$

$$= 1 - 2^{\log((1-3\lambda)^{\frac{\log 1/3}{\log(1-3\lambda)}})} = 1 - 2^{\frac{\log 1/3}{\log(1-3\lambda)} \times \log((1-3\lambda)} = 1 - 2^{\log 1/3} = \frac{2}{3}. \tag{39}$$

Since for any real number $u > 0$, $1 - u \leq e^{-u} \leq 2^{-u}$, we have

$$k = \frac{\log 1/3}{\log(1-3\lambda)} \leq \frac{\log 1/3}{\log 2^{(-3\lambda)}} = \frac{\log 3}{3\lambda}. \tag{40}$$

Thus, $Q(\mathrm{DISJ}_\lambda) \leq \frac{\log 3}{3\lambda}(3 + 2\log n)$.

□

4.2. Deterministic lower bound

To prove the Theorem, we will use a modification of the lower bound proof method from [9, 11].

Theorem 6. *The deterministic communication complexity $D(DISJ_\lambda) \in \mathbf{\Omega}(n)$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{P}$ be a deterministic protocol for DISJ_λ. We consider the set $F_\lambda = \{x \in \{0,1\}^n \,|\, \lambda n \leq |x| \leq (1-\lambda)n\}$. If $x \in F_\lambda$, then also $\overline{x} \in F_\lambda$, where $\overline{x} = \overline{x}_1 \cdots \overline{x}_n$. Let the set $E = \{(x, \overline{x}) \,|\, x \in F_\lambda\}$, then for every $(x, \overline{x}) \in E$, we have $\mathcal{P}(x, \overline{x}) = 1$. Suppose there is a 1-monochromatic rectangle $R = A \times B \subseteq \{0,1\}^n \times \{0,1\}^n$ such that $\mathcal{P}(x,y) = 1$ for every pair of promise input $(x,y) \in R$. For $S = R \cap E$, we now prove that $|S| < 1.99^n$.

Suppose $|S| \geq 1.99^n$. According to Corollary 1.2 from [14], there exist $(x, \overline{x}) \in S$ and $(z, \overline{z}) \in S$ such that $|x \wedge z| = \frac{n}{4}$. Since $S \subseteq E$, we have $x, \overline{x}, z, \overline{z} \in F_\lambda$. Without a lost of generality, let

$$x = \overbrace{1\cdots1}^{n/4}\ \overbrace{0\cdots0}^{\lambda n}\ \overbrace{1\cdots1}^{\lambda n}\ \overbrace{*\cdots*}^{3n/4-2\lambda n}, \text{and} \tag{41}$$

$$z = \overbrace{1\cdots1}^{n/4}\ \overbrace{1\cdots1}^{\lambda n}\ \overbrace{0\cdots0}^{\lambda n}\ \overbrace{*\cdots*}^{3n/4-2\lambda n}. \tag{42}$$

In such a case

$$\overline{x} = \overbrace{0\cdots0}^{n/4}\ \overbrace{1\cdots1}^{\lambda n}\ \overbrace{0\cdots0}^{\lambda n}\ \overbrace{*\cdots*}^{3n/4-2\lambda n} \tag{43}$$

and therefore $\lambda n \leq |z \wedge \overline{x}| \leq 3n/4 - \lambda n < (1-\lambda)n$. Thus, $\mathcal{P}(z, \overline{x}) = 0$. Since $S \subset R$ and R is 1-rectangle, we get $(x, \overline{x}) \in R, (z, \overline{z}) \in R$ and $(z, \overline{x}) \in R$. Since $(z, \overline{x})$ is a pair of promise input and therefore $\mathcal{P}(z, \overline{x}) = 1$, which is a contradiction.

Therefore, the minimum number of 1-monochromatic rectangles that partition the space of inputs is

$$C^1(\mathrm{DISJ}_\lambda) \geq \frac{|E|}{|S|} = \frac{|F_\lambda|}{|S|} \geq \frac{|F_{1/4}|}{|S|} > \frac{2^n/2}{1.99^n}. \tag{44}$$

According to Lemma 1, the deterministic communication complexity is then

$$D(\mathrm{DISJ}_\lambda) \geq \log C^1(\mathrm{DISJ}_\lambda) > \log(\frac{2^n/2}{1.99^n}) = n - 1 - n\log 1.99 > n - 1 - 0.9927n = 0.0073n - 1. \tag{45}$$

Thus, $D(\mathrm{DISJ}_\lambda) \in \mathbf{\Omega}(n)$. □

Remark 3. The lower bound proved in the previous theorem is quite a weak bound. We expect that a better lower bound will be relative to λ. When λ is close to 0, then the low bound is expected to be close to n instead of 0.007n.

4.3. Probabilistic protocol

As already mentioned, the two-sided error probabilistic communication complexity $R(\mathrm{DISJ}) \in \mathbf{\Omega}(n)$. However, for DISJ_λ, the communication complexity can be dramatically improved as will now be shown.

Theorem 7. *The probabilistic communication complexity* $R(DISJ_{\frac{1}{4}}) \leq 5\log n$.

Proof. Let us consider the probabilistic protocol $\mathcal{P}$ which works as follows:

1. If $|x| < k$, then Alice just sends 1 as the result of $\mathrm{DISJ}_{\frac{1}{4}}(x,y)$ to Bob. Otherwise, Alice chooses randomly k bits of '1's of her input, says $x_{i_1}, \cdots, x_{i_k}$, and sends their positions $i_1, \cdots, i_k$ to Bob.
2. If Bob does not receive 1 as the result from Alice, then he checks the positions $i_1, \cdots, i_k$ of his input. If there exists a $y_{i_j} = 1$ such that $1 \leq j \leq k$, then $\mathcal{P}(x,y) = 0$; otherwise $\mathcal{P}(x,y) = 1$.

If $\sum_{i=1}^n x_i \wedge y_i = 0$, then

$$Pr(\mathcal{P}(x,y) = \mathrm{DISJ}_{\frac{1}{4}}(x,y) = 1) = 1. \tag{46}$$

If $n/4 \leq \sum_{i=1}^n x_i \wedge y_i \leq 3n/4$, then for any $i \in \{i_1, \cdots, i_k\}$

$$Pr(y_i = x_i) \geq \frac{1}{4}. \tag{47}$$

Therefore,

$$Pr(\mathcal{P}(x,y) = 0) \geq 1 - (1 - \frac{1}{4})^k = 1 - (\frac{3}{4})^k. \tag{48}$$

If $k = 5$, then $Pr(\mathcal{P}(x,y) = 0) > 0.76 > \frac{2}{3}$. Since Alice needs $\log n$ bits to specifies every position, we have $R(\mathrm{DISJ}_{\frac{1}{4}}) \leq 5\log n$. □

Theorem 8. *The probabilistic communication complexity* $R(DISJ_\lambda) \leq \frac{\log 3}{\lambda}\log n$.

Proof. For this general cases, we use the same protocol as in the proof of the previous theorem, but Alice will send more positions of her '1' bits input.

If $\sum_{i=1}^n x_i \wedge y_i = 0$, then

$$Pr(\mathcal{P}(x,y) = \mathrm{DISJ}_\lambda(x,y) = 1) = 1. \tag{49}$$

If $\lambda n \leq \sum_{i=1}^n x_i \wedge y_i \leq (1-\lambda)n$, then for any $i \in \{i_1, \cdots, i_k\}$

$$Pr(y_i = x_i) \geq \lambda. \tag{50}$$

Therefore,

$$Pr(\mathcal{P}(x,y) = 0) \geq 1 - (1-\lambda)^k. \tag{51}$$

If $k = \frac{\log 1/3}{\log(1-\lambda)}$, then $Pr(\mathcal{P}(x,y) = 0) \geq \frac{2}{3}$. Thus, $R(\mathrm{DISJ}_\lambda) \leq \frac{\log 1/3}{\log(1-\lambda)}\log n \leq \frac{\log 3}{\lambda}\log n$. □

Remark 4. If λ is close to $\frac{1}{n}$, then the quantum and probabilistic communication complexity advantages in Theorem 5 and Theorem 8 disappear. We can define two-sided error mode as tolerating an error probability ε instead of $\frac{1}{3}$. Modifying our proof in Theorem 5 and Theorem 8, we can get $Q(\mathrm{DISJ}_\lambda) \leq \frac{\log \varepsilon}{3\lambda}(3 + 2\log n)$ and $R(\mathrm{DISJ}_\lambda) \leq \frac{\log \varepsilon}{\lambda}\log n$ for any error probability ε. When ε is close to $\frac{1}{2^n}$, the the quantum and probabilistic communication complexity advantages in Theorem 5 and Theorem 8 disappear.

5. Applications to finite automata

Klauck [20] proved, for any language, that the state complexity of exact quantum/classical finite automata is not less than the state complexity of an equivalent one-way deterministic finite automata (1DFA). However, situation is different for some promise problems [3, 34].

For any $n \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, we consider promise problem $A_{EQ_k}(n)$ corresponding to EQ_k that is defined as follow:

$$A_{EQ_k}(n) : \begin{cases} A_{yes}(n) = \{x\#y \,|\, H(x,y) = 0, x, y \in \{0,1\}^n\} \\ A_{no}(n) = \{x\#y \,|\, H(x,y) = k, x, y \in \{0,1\}^n\}, \end{cases} \tag{52}$$

where $k \geq \frac{n}{2}$.

The quantum protocol for EQ_k which is described in Theorem 1 can be implemented on an MO-1QCFA as shown bellow. Therefore, we get the following result:

Theorem 9. *The promise problem $A_{EQ_k}(n)$ can be solved exactly by an MO-1QCFA $\mathcal{A}(n)$ with $n+1$ quantum basis states and $\mathbf{O}(n)$ classical states, whereas the sizes of the corresponding 1DFA are $2^{\mathbf{\Omega}(n)}$ if $k = \lambda n$.*

1. Read the left end-marker ¢, perform $U_{¢} = U_h U_k$ on the initial quantum state $|0\rangle$, change its classical state to $\delta(s_0, ¢) = s_1$, and move the tape head one cell to the right.
2. Until the currently scanned symbol σ is not #, do the following:
 2.1 Apply $\Theta(s_i, \sigma) = U_{i,\sigma}$ to the current quantum state.
 2.2 Change the classical state s_i to s_{i+1} and move the tape head one cell to the right.
3. Change the classical state s_{n+1} to s_1 and move the tape head one cell to the right.
4. While the currently scanned symbol σ is not the right end-marker \$, do the following:
 2.1 Apply $\Theta(s_i, \sigma) = U_{i,\sigma}$ to the current quantum state.
 2.2 Change the classical state s_i to s_{i+1} and move the tape head one cell to the right.
5. When the right end-marker is reached, perform $U_{\$} = U_k^{-1} U_h^{-1}$ on the current quantum state, measure the current quantum state with $M = \{P_i = |i\rangle\langle i|\}_{i=0}^{n}$. If the outcome is $|0\rangle$, accept the input; otherwise reject the input.

Figure 2: Description of the behavior of $\mathcal{A}(n)$ when solving the promise problem $A_{EQ_k}(n)$.

Proof. Let $x = x_1 \cdots x_n$ and $y = y_1 \cdots y_n$. Let us consider an MO-1QCFA $\mathcal{A}(n)$ with $n+1$ quantum basis states $\{|i\rangle : i = 0, 1, 2, \cdots, n\}$. $\mathcal{A}(n)$ will start in the initial quantum state $|0\rangle$ and then perform will a unitary transformation $U_{¢} = U_h U_k$ to the state $|0\rangle$, where U_h, U_k are the ones defined in the proof of Theorem 1. We use classical states $s_i \in S$ $(1 \leq i \leq n+1)$ to point out the positions of the tape head that will provide some information for quantum transformations. If the classical state of $\mathcal{A}(n)$ will be s_i $(1 \leq i \leq n)$ that will mean that the next scanned symbol of the tape head is the i-th symbol of $x(y)$ and s_{n+1} means that the next scanned symbol of the tape head is #(\$). The automaton proceeds as shown in Figure 3, where

$$U_{i,\sigma}|i\rangle = (-1)^{\sigma}|i\rangle \text{ and } U_{i,\sigma}|j\rangle = |j\rangle \text{ for } j \neq i \tag{53}$$

The rest part of the proof is analogues of the proof in Theorem 1.

The deterministic communication complexity of EQ_k is $\mathbf{\Omega}(n)$. Therefore, the sizes of the corresponding 1DFA are $2^{\mathbf{\Omega}(n)}$ [22]. □

We now apply also the communication complexity results for DISJ_λ to finite automata. Let us consider the following promise problem

$$A_D(n) : \begin{cases} A_{yes}(n) = \{x\#y\#x \mid \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i \wedge y_i = 0, x, y \in \{0,1\}^n\} \\ A_{no}(n) = \{x\#y\#x \mid \frac{1}{4}n \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i \wedge y_i \leq \frac{3}{4}n, x, y \in \{0,1\}^n\} \end{cases} . \tag{54}$$

We implement the protocols used in Section 4 for an MO-1QCFA and for a one-way probabilistic finite automaton (1PFA) and get the following result:

Theorem 10. *The promise problem $A_D(n)$ can be solved with one-sided error $\frac{1}{4}$ by an MO-1QCFA $\mathcal{A}(n)$ with $2n$ quantum basis states and $\mathbf{O}(n)$ classical states and also by a 1PFA $\mathcal{P}(n)$ with $\mathbf{O}(n^5)$ states, whereas the sizes of the corresponding 1DFA are $2^{\mathbf{\Omega}(n)}$.*

1. Read the left end-marker ¢, perform U_s on the initial quantum state $|1,0\rangle$, change its classical state to $\delta(s_0, ¢) = s_1$, and move the tape head one cell to the right.
2. While the currently scanned symbol σ is not #, do the following:
 2.1 Apply $\Theta(s_i, \sigma) = U_{i,\sigma}$ to the current quantum state.
 2.2 Change the classical state s_i to s_{i+1} and move the tape head one cell to the right.
3. Move the tape head one cell to the right.
4. While the currently scanned symbol σ is not #, do the following:
 4.1 Apply $\Theta(s_{n+i}, \sigma) = V_{i,\sigma}$ to the current quantum state.
 4.2 Change the classical state s_{n+i} to s_{n+i+1} and move the tape head one cell to the right.
5. Change the classical state s_{2n+1} to s_1 and move the tape head one cell to the right.
6. While the currently scanned symbol σ is not the right end-marker \$, do the following:
 6.1 Apply $\Theta(s_i, \sigma) = U_{i,\sigma}$ to the current quantum state.
 6.2 Change the classical state s_i to s_{i+1} and move the tape head one cell to the right.
7. When the right end-marker \$ is reached, perform U_f on the current quantum state, measure the current quantum state with $M = \{|i,0\rangle\langle i,0|, |i,1\rangle\langle i,1|\}_{i=1}^{n}$. If the outcome is $|1,0\rangle$, accept the input; otherwise reject the input.

Figure 3: Description of the behavior of $\mathcal{A}(n)$ when solving the promise problem $A_D(n)$.

Proof. Let $x = x_1 \cdots x_n$ and $y = y_1 \cdots y_n$. Let us consider an MO-1QCFA $\mathcal{A}(n)$ with $2n$ quantum basis states $\{|i,0\rangle, |i,1\rangle\}_{i=1}^{n}$ that will start in the state $|1,0\rangle = (1, \overbrace{0, \cdots, 0}^{2n-1})^T$. The automaton proceeds as shown in Figure 3, where U_s, U_f are the ones defined in the proof of Theorem 4 and

$$U_{i,\sigma}|j,0\rangle = |j,1\rangle \text{ and } U_{i,\sigma}|j,1\rangle = |j,0\rangle \text{ if } \sigma = 1 \text{ and } j = i \text{ otherwise } U_{i,\sigma}|j,k\rangle = |j,k\rangle; \tag{55}$$

$$V_{i,\sigma}|j,1\rangle = (-1)^{\sigma}|j,1\rangle \text{ if } j = i, \text{ otherwise } V_{i,\sigma}|j,k\rangle = |j,k\rangle; \tag{56}$$

It is easy to verify that for $1 \leq i \leq n$, $U_{i,\sigma}$ and $V_{i,\sigma}$ are unitary transformations. According to the analysis in the proof of Theorem 4, if the input string $w \in A_{yes}(n)$, the automaton will get the outcome $|1,0\rangle$ in Step 7 with certainty and therefore

$$Pr[\mathcal{A} \text{ accepts } w] = 1. \tag{57}$$

If the input string $w \in A_{no}(n)$, the automaton gets the outcome $|1,0\rangle$ with probability not more than $1/4$. Thus,

$$Pr[\mathcal{A} \text{ rejects } w] \geq \frac{3}{4}. \tag{58}$$

According to the protocol used in the proof of Theorem 7 and the probabilistic communication complexity is not more than $5 \log n$, it is easy to design a 1PFA with $O(n^5)$ state to solve the promise problem.

We now prove the deterministic state complexity lower bound as following:

Let an N-states 1DFA $\mathcal{A}'(n) = (S, \Sigma, \delta, s_0, S_{acc})$ solves the promise problem $A_D(n)$, then we can get a deterministic protocol for $\text{DISJ}_{\frac{1}{4}}(x, y)$ as follows:

1. Alice simulates the computation of $\mathcal{A}'(n)$ on input "$x\#$" and then sends her state $\widehat{\delta}(s_0, x\#)$ to Bob.
2. Bob simulates the computation of $\mathcal{A}'(n)$ on input "$y\#$" starting at state $\widehat{\delta}(s_0, x\#)$, and then sends his state $\widehat{\delta}(s_0, x\#y\#)$ to Alice.
3. Alice simulates the computation of $\mathcal{A}'(n)$ on input "x" starting at state $\widehat{\delta}(s_0, x\#y\#)$. If $\widehat{\delta}(s_0, x\#y\#x) \in S_{acc}$ then Alice sends the result 1 to Bob, otherwise Alice sends the result 0 to Bob.

The deterministic complexity of the above protocol is $1 + 2 \log N$ and therefore $D(\text{DISJ}_{\frac{1}{4}}) \leq 1 + 2 \log N$. According to the analysis in Theorem 6, we have

$$1 + 2 \log N \geq D(\text{DISJ}_{\frac{1}{4}}) > 0.0073n - 1 \tag{59}$$

$$\Rightarrow N \in 2^{\mathbf{\Omega}(n)}. \tag{60}$$

□

6. Conclusion

We have explored generalizations of the Deutsch-Jozsa promise problem and its communication and also query complexity. Promise versions of the disjointness problem also have been discussed. Finally, some applications in finite automata have been given.

Some possible problems for future work are:

1. We have been generalized the distributed Deutsch-Jozsa promise problem to determine whether $H(x, y) = 0$ or $H(x, y) = k$, where $k \geq \frac{n}{2}$. Can we prove similar results for the cases that $k < \frac{n}{2}$?
2. Can you find a promise version of the disjointness problem such that exact quantum communication complexity can be exponential better than the deterministic communication complexity?

Acknowledgements

We thank Abuzer Yakaryilmaz for useful comments about earlier drafts of this paper. Work of the first and third authors supported by the Employment of Newly Graduated Doctors of Science for Scientific Excellence project/grant (CZ.1.07./2.3.00/30.0009) of Czech Republic. Work of second author supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Nos. 61272058, 61073054).

References

[1] S. Aaronson, A. Ambainis, Quantum search of spatial regions, In Proceedings of 44th IEEE FOCS (2003) 200–209.

[2] A. Ambainis, J. Watrous, Two-way finite automata with quantum and classical states, Theoretical Computer Science **287** (2002) 299–311.

[3] A. Ambainis, A. Yakaryilmaz, Superiority of exact quantum automata for promise problems, Information Processing Letters **112** (7) (2012) 289–291.

[4] A. Ambainis, Superlinear advantage for exact quantum algorithms, In Proceedings of 45th ACM STOC (2013) 891–900.

[5] A. Ambainis, A. Iraids, J. Smotrovs, Exact quantum query complexity of EXACT and THRESHOLD, arXiv:1302.1235.

[6] Z. Bar-Yossef, T. S. Jayram, R. Kumar, D. Sivakumar, An information statistics approach to data stream and communication complexity, Journal of Computer and System Sciences **68** (2004) 702–732.

[7] G. Brassard, Quantum communication complexity, Foundations of Physics **70** (2003) 1593–1616,

[8] G. Brassard, P. Høyer, An exact quantum polynomial-time algorithm for Simon's problem, In Proceedings of the Israeli Symposium on Theory of Computing and Systems (1997) 12–23.

[9] H. Buhrman, R. Cleve and A. Wigderson, Quantum vs. classical communication and computation, In Proceedings of 30th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (1998) 63–68.

[10] H. Buhrman, R. de Wolf. Communication complexity lower bounds by polynomials. In Proceedings of 16th IEEE Conference on Computational Complexity (2001) 120–130.

[11] H. Buhrman, R. Cleve, S. Massar, R. de Wolf, Nonlocality and Communication Complexity, Rev. Mod. Phys. **82** (2010) 665–698. Also arXiv:0907.3584 (2009).

[12] H. Buhrman, R.de Wolf, Complexity measures and decision tree complexity: a survey, Theoretical Computer Science **288** (2002) 21–43.

[13] D. Deutsch, R.Jozsa, Rapid solution of problems by quantum computation, In Proceedings of the Royal Society of London (1992), volume A439, 553–558.

[14] P. Frankl and V. Rodl, Forbidden intersections, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 300, 1, (1987) 259–286.

[15] J. Gruska, Quantum Computing, McGraw-Hill, London (1999).

[16] J. Gruska, Descriptional complexity issues in quantum computing. J. Automata, Languages Combin. **5** (3) (2000) 191–218.

[17] J. E. Hopcroft, J. D. Ullman, Introduction to Automata Theory, Languages, and Computation, Addision-Wesley, New York (1979).

[18] J. Hromkovič, Communication Complexity and Parallel Computing, Springer, Berlin (1997).

[19] J. Hromkovič, G. Schintger, On the Power of Las Vegas for One-Way Communication Complexity, OBDDs, and Finite Automata, Information and Computation **169** (2001) 284–296.

[20] H. Klauck, On quantum and probabilistic communication: Las Vegas and one-way protocols, Proceedings of the 32th annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing (2000) 644-651.

[21] B. Kalyanasundaram, G. Schintger, The probabilistic communication complexity of set intersection, SIAM Journal on Discrete Mathematics **5** (1992) 545–557.

[22] E. Kushilevitz, N. Nisan, Communication Complexity, Cambridge University Press (1997).

[23] A. Montanaro, R. Jozsa, G. Mitchison, On exact quantum query complexity, arXiv:1111.0475.

[24] M. A. Nielsen, I. L. Chuang, Quantum Computation and Quantum Information, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (2000).

[25] D. W. Qiu, L. Z. Li, P. Mateus, J. Gruska, Quantum finite automata, CRC Handbook of Finite State Based Models and Applications, CRC Press (2012) 113–144.

[26] D.W. Qiu, L.Z. Li, P. Mateus, A. Sernadas, Exponentially more concise quantum recognition of non-RMM regular languages, arXiv:0909.1428v5.

[27] A. Razborov, On the distributional complexity of disjointness, Theor. Comput. Sci. **106** (1992) 385–390.

[28] A. Razborov, Quantum communication complexity of symmetric predicates, Izvestiya of the Russian Academy of Sciences, mathematics **67** (2003) 159–176.

[29] A. C. Yao, Some Complexity Questions Related to Distributed Computing, in: Proc. of 11th STOC (1979) 209–213.

[30] A. Yakaryilmaz, A. C. Cem Say, Succinctness of two-way probabilistic and quantum finite automata, Discrete Mathematics and Theoretical Computer Science **12** (4) (2010) 19–40.

[31] S. Yu, State Complexity: Recent Results and Open Problems, Fundamenta Informaticae **64** (2005) 471–480.

[32] S.G. Zheng, D.W. Qiu, L.Z. Li, J. Gruska, One-way finite automata with quantum and classical states, Dassow Festschrift 2012, LNCS **7300** (2012) 273–290.

[33] S. G. Zheng, D. W. Qiu, J. Gruska, L. Z. Li, P. Mateus. State succinctness of two-way finite automata with quantum and classical states, Theoretical Computer Science, **499** (2013) 98–112.

[34] S. G. Zheng, J. Gruska, D. W. Qiu, On the state complexity of semi-quantum finite automata. RAIRO-Theoretical Informatics and Applications, accepted , DOI: 10.1051/ita/2014003.

[35] S. G. Zheng, J. Gruska and D. W. Qiu. Power of the interactive proof systems with verifiers modeled by semi-quantum two-way finite automata, arXiv:1304.3876 (2013).